Procurement Modernization Commission
Efficiencies Work Group Meeting Minutes
April 15, 2016

Outcomes:
Reduce transaction costs.
Increase efficiencies and make procurement process more accessible to businesses.
Allow procurement staff to more effectively manage their time.
Make it easier for businesses to understand and respond.

Opportunities for Improvement:
(b) Reduction of transaction costs for State agencies by utilizing new technologies to increase efficiencies and make the procurement process more accessible to businesses;
(g) Simplification of procurement reporting requirements to allow agency procurement staff to more effectively manage their time;
(j) Simplification of the current Request For Proposal (RFP) template to make it be easier for businesses to understand and respond;
(k) Reduction in the number of documents businesses are required to submit with proposals prior to a contract award;
(n) Determination of how best to address clearly evident mistakes on procurement submissions;
(l) Review the mandatory terms and conditions of procurement contracts;
(p) Development of a mechanism that would deter bidders from submitting frivolous protests;

1. Roll Call
    a) Meeting began approximately 2:05 with introductions of in-person attendees (see sign-in sheet) and those on phone.

2. Opportunities
    a) eMM
        a. New version is expected to be released in May
        b. Periscope has not yet shared the release with the State
        c. New version will be evaluated to determine how well it meets needs
    b) FMIS
        a. 2 systems, MDOT & State. Though different there is a synch process in place
        b. Potential 50% discrepancy between SBR registration database and actuals. Results in erroneous reporting
        c. A request for FMIS users to offer functionality issues. WG suggests that the subcommittee be the focal point for getting user input.
        d. Contract Management
            i. Though not a listed opportunity WG feels it is a valuable addition to the new eMM-FMIS integration.
        e. Discussed the possibility of procuring a new enterprise system vs the upgrade of existing systems.
    c) Reporting requirements
        a. Discussed consolidating this with item e- Reduce Number of Documents submitted.
        b. Discussed a suggestion of moving from paper reports to eReports.
    d) RFP Template

a. Discussed efforts of DoIT, DBM & DGS to create a unified template with standard sections to ease navigation and ensure commonality of term usage across the state.
    i. A having a team developed between those Agencies and MDOT to address the template
e) Reduce Number of Documents submitted prior to award
    a. Cover during c above
f) Curing RFP mistakes
    a. Discussed both cure of MBE and non MBE issues
    b. Herb Jordan mentioned that some of the MBE issues are deeper than surface review
    c. Discussion of how automation may assist by preventing incomplete packages from being submitted.
    d. Also included was discussion of how the State corrects errors in published RFPs
g) Review Terms and Conditions
    a. Discussion of developing additional types of T&C categories for construction, IT, etc.
    b. Modernize required terms- what no longer serve the purpose they were mandated for?
    c. Excessive T&Cs cause price increases to the State.
    d. Discussed the possibility of a terms and conditions library
    e. Discussed allowing our vendor partners review and comment on terms and conditions in an effort to understand why some businesses decide not to bid our opportunities
h) Centralized point of access
    a. Discussed having one portal or entrance into all things procurement. Can eMM play that role or do we have a facing page that points to the Agencies and eSystem(s)?

3. Outcomes
    a) Discussed the 3 stated outcomes.
        a. *Increase efficiencies and make procurement process more accessible to businesses.*
        b. *Allow procurement staff to more effectively manage their time.*
        c. *Make it easier for businesses to understand and respond.*
    b) Are these actually best described as an overall goal of Increase efficiencies and make procurement process more accessible. And items b & c are actually the two different sides of the issue?

4. Sub-Groups
    a) Though the discussions of item 2, the group decided that Sub-Groups are the most effective way to review the opportunities.
    b) Proposed was to create 3 sub-groups
        a. Commonality
            i. *RFP Template*
            ii. *Review Terms and Conditions*
            iii. *Centralized point of access*
        b. *Technology*
            i. *eMM*
            ii. *FMIS*
            iii. *Contract Management (new)*
        c. *Reducing Overhead*
            i. *Reporting Requirements*
            ii. *Reduce Number of Documents submitted prior to award*
            iii. *Curing RFP mistakes*
    c) There was an additional discussion of including item f in all categories.

*** Please send Mike and Al your first and second preferred sub-group so that we can get the assignments distributed quickly**.

5. Define Opportunities/ Priorities
   - *a)* We discussed and determined that over all there is not a priority, it is a joint project between State and vendor
   - *b)* Each sub-group should include a review and information regarding **any** opportunity that might impact their groups review.
6. Resources and Methods
   - a) Consensus of the group was that we would get resources from the agencies on the sub-groups along with offers from the vendors.
   - b) With (or closely following) the publication of the minutes the chairs will request volunteers for each of the sub-groups, both a main and secondary interest.
7. How will the strategies be prepared and presented
   - a) This seemed to get punted to being discussed at the main Commission meeting.
8. Adjourn
   - a) Meeting adjourned approximately 4:10